



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

supreme authority, in matters of faith, to the Pope or a General Council?" Answer. I am certain you possess a great intellect; but am not so certain where it is lodged, whether in the pineal gland, or in the whole brain. So am I certain that there is now, and has been, many an article of faith, such as the real presence, confession of sins, &c., received by the whole Catholic Church—which reception makes them infallibly orthodox with me, though never, perhaps, formally defined by a General Council, as the nature of the Son was at Nicea. But should any as yet undefined article (as the immaculate conception was, some years ago) come to be questioned by some Catholics, causing dissensions within the Church; then would assemble a Council in communion with the Pope, pending which, the orthodox belief on that article would be in suspense, but no longer. After the Council, it is settled. But, you ask, by whom, or in what way? I can no more answer this than I can its parallel—the metaphysical question above. Perhaps this will be rendered more intelligible by the answer you give to this question. Is this a Scriptural expression—"The Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit is one and the same God?" or is the like to be found in any of the Ante-Nicene divines that have come down to our time? If yes, show me where. If no, then how came we to know so momentous a truth—so deep a mystery? If you say neither yes nor no, but that we arrived at it by profound interpretation of the rhapsodical texts of the first three centuries; then I reply, there is no knowing what interpretation may yet achieve.

Yours sincerely,

WILLIAM GERAGHTY.

[Dr. Geraghty has in the foregoing letter poured out such a torrent of references upon us that we can scarcely hope either to examine them all within the compass of a single number, nor, if we did, could we hope that one reader in a thousand would take the trouble of perusing what we should write in reply to them. We hope, however, to present our readers with enough to enable them to find their way through the labyrinth in which Dr. Geraghty's learning and industry has entangled them.

In reply to Dr. Geraghty's question, "Where is the whole current of Scripture in favour of investing a woman with the spiritual supremacy, or of lodging it in the crown?" we reply, that the "supremacy" which we attribute to the crown is a totally different thing from the "supremacy" which he attributes to the Pope.

We believe with him that Christ has committed "authority" to His Church. We differ with him in thinking that this "authority" is committed to "the Church," and not to the Pope. We do not differ from him by holding that this authority is given to the crown of England. We hold that the crown of England has no share or part in that spiritual authority which Christ has committed to His Church.

But we believe that the power of temporal law and external coercion is given to princes, and not to the Bishops or the Pope.

It is the duty of princes to support by temporal law and power the authority which Christ has committed to His Church. The crown, which gives that temporal support, is supreme in the administration of that temporal support. This is all the "supremacy" we attribute to the crown. We maintain this against the Bishop of Rome, who has claimed supreme control over temporal power in England in respect of spiritual authority.

We may return to this subject again; but we trust that what we have now said is sufficient to explain to Dr. Geraghty our notions about the "supremacy of the crown."

We scarcely think that Dr. Geraghty has treated us, or, indeed, himself, fairly, when he satisfies himself with replying to our assertion about Father Launoy having collected 44 extracts from the fathers, which treat the faith that St. Peter confessed, and not Peter himself, as the rock on which the Church was built, by saying "there must be some mistake here." Father Launoy is no obscure writer; his works are of easy access to every man of Dr. Geraghty's learning, and we gave the exact reference to the place in which the extracts are to be found.^a Dr. Geraghty does not say that he has consulted Launoy, and that we have mistaken or misrepresented his meaning; nor does he venture to assert that any of Launoy's extracts are spurious. Dr. Geraghty will find that Launoy gives, honestly, nearly every name relied on by Dr. G. himself, with the exception of two or three comparatively obscure ones; the only difference being, that Dr. G. makes out 51 instead of 22, by counting the passages quoted instead of the fathers he quotes, while Father Launoy, we think, properly counts each of the 44 fathers only as one, though in some cases he gives three or four extracts from each; if he had counted passages instead of fathers, as Dr. G. has done, he would have much exceeded Dr. G.'s list of 51 quotations, which we think ought only to count as 22. But whether the number in favour of Dr. G.'s interpretation be 51 or 22, while there are 44 or 64 on the other side, we think we are equally well justified in the assertion we made, viz., that there is no such universal consent of the fathers as to the true interpretation of the passage in Matthew xvi., as would make it at all safe to base such a fabric upon it as the Papal supremacy. As to the sup-

posed distinction between using words in a literal and a casual sense (whatever that means), we think we might just as well retort the argument, and say Launoy's extracts from the 44 fathers were the literal, and Dr. G.'s the casual sense; and, indeed, how the Church could be built upon the person of any man, except in a highly figurative or allegorical sense, we are at a loss to conceive; in a literal sense the expression would obviously be mere nonsense. That our blessed Lord was speaking allegorically or figuratively, not literally, seems to us to be perfectly certain, and if so, why might He not build His Church as well upon the faith confessed by Peter as upon Peter himself, just as the Church of England may be said to be built upon the ancient confessions of faith known as the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, or the Church of Germany on the confession of Augsburg?

As to the grandiloquent speech made by Celestine's legate at the Council of Ephesus, on which nothing turned, and which led to no recognition of the Papal authority, we think the "nemine contradicente" of Dr. Geraghty amounts to very little more than this, (even if we could safely rely on its authenticity),¹ that no one was then so long-sighted as to anticipate to what a length Papal assumptions were likely thereafter to grow, or so captious or ill-bred as to interrupt the legate in his oratorical flourishes. Pope Celestine, it will be recollected, was one of the popes who was concerned in endeavouring to foist the "supremacy" of Rome on the Church of Africa, on the authority of a false canon of the Council of Nice. So that we do not much regard what that pope's legates may have said. That, it would be a great delusion, however, to infer from such a speech that the authority of the Bishop of Rome over both the Eastern and Western Churches was then unanimously acknowledged we can prove demonstratively from the canons of the very Council of Chalcedon to which Dr. Geraghty also refers; but as this would lead us into too long a disquisition, we defer entering upon that point for the present, hoping to resume it ere long in a future number.

It is utterly out of our power to follow Dr. Geraghty at present, through the writings of St. Eucherius, St. Asterius, St. Orsiesius, or others of little note in the 5th century, nor if we could, do we think such comparatively obscure writers could add much weight to such testimonies as those of St. Cyprian,² St. Ambrose, St. Epiphanius, or St. Chrysostom, on whom Dr. Geraghty also relies, if they were at all clear upon the matter in question. We have not time at this moment to examine with the care they deserve the passages referred to, but from other passages which we cited in our 6th vol., pp. 17, 18, from these very fathers and others, we think we were quite justified in saying with Dr. Barrow, "How could those great masters more clearly express their mind than our Lord in those words³ to St. Peter did *incaute a duty novise peculiar to him*, but equally, together with him, belonging to all guides of the Church, in such manner as when a master doth press a duty on one servant, he doth thereby admonish all his servants to the like duty."⁴

As to the quotations from Eusebius, St. Hilary, St. Cyril, St. Optatus, St. Gregory Nazianzum, St. Chrysostom, &c., in which St. Peter is styled prince, or head, or leader of the Apostles, and the like, we think they may be safely disposed of as beside the real question, which is not one of rank or precedence, but one of authority and jurisdiction. A duke may be the head of the House of Peers, or a distinguished orator the leader of the House of Commons, without having the slightest authority or jurisdiction over the rest of the house, in which he has the acknowledged pre-eminence in rank or talent. A celebrated singer may be the head of a choir; a Cicero or a Demosthenes may be the prince of orators, or a Shakespeare the prince of poets, without implying the slightest authority or jurisdiction over either their contemporaries or their successors; and just so may St. Peter have been spoken of rhetorically as the "prince or head of the Apostles" without the slightest intention on the part of the writer to convey that he had even so much power over the rest of the Apostles, as the chairman of a committee or president of a society has over the body whose deliberations he presides over.

We asked our correspondent a simple question, whether he considers the supreme authority in matters of faith to be the pope or a general council; and in doing so we only asked, in fact, to which of two great parties, which long divided the Roman Catholic Church, Dr. G. belongs. This was the great question discussed and decided one way by the Council of Basle, A.D. 1432-1438, but whose decrees were afterwards disputed by the popes. It is, we think, a question that must be decided by every sincere Roman Catholic one way or other; and if Dr. G. expects to convert us or our readers to his Church, he is bound distinctly to let us know where its authority is

seated. No one, for instance, can now join the Roman Catholic Church without (we presume) adopting, with the rest, the recently defined dogma of the immaculate conception. We know that it was not defined by the authority of a general council. If the seat of supreme authority in matters of faith be in the pope, then we should be bound by this newly defined article of faith; but if the seat of infallibility be in a general council, or in a general council jointly with the pope, we should not be bound to receive this dogma. It is, therefore, not a merely theoretical or metaphysical, but a practical inquiry of the utmost importance. We can very well, with Dr. G., afford to confess our ignorance where the intellect is lodged, whether it be in the pineal gland or in the whole brain; for it does not in the least degree alter or modify our estimate either as to the power or soundness of the intellect, whether it is situated in the one or in the other. It is quite otherwise of the seat of authority. We rather collect that Dr. G. thinks a general council necessary; for he says, "Should any undefined article (such as the immaculate conception was some years ago) come to be questioned by some Catholics, causing dissensions within the Church, then would assemble a council in communion with the pope, pending which the orthodox belief on that article would be in suspense, but no longer. After the council, it is settled." But we think, if this be Dr. G.'s opinion, viz., that a general council, in connection with the pope, is necessary, we must still consider the disputed doctrine of the immaculate conception to be in suspense; for, assuredly, it was not only questioned by multitudes of Roman Catholics, and caused terrible dissensions within the Church for several centuries, but no council has yet assembled to define it. The pope took on himself to do so by his own authority, without a council. Therefore it must, according to that view, be still in suspense, and not yet settled! Will Dr. G. tell us frankly, is that doctrine yet settled or is it in suspense? We are sure he is candid and manly enough to give us a distinct answer. And we pause to receive it. We do not think our correspondent can parry the question which involves so disputed a point, by asking us another about a matter in which we fully agree—viz., the mysterious doctrine of the Holy Trinity. If he requires to know how we came to believe in it, we answer frankly, because we think it to be capable of satisfactory proof out of the holy Scriptures, which we believe to contain all things necessary to salvation. As to the word Trinity, as it is not to be found in Scripture, we attach no importance to it, except as a convenient and expressive term universally used by all denominations of Christians, whether agreeing with it or not. If a man believes in the Divinity of our blessed Lord, and the personality of the Holy Ghost, and is baptized in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as our Lord commanded before He ascended into heaven, he is a believer in the Trinity, though he had never heard the word in his lifetime. This is no matter of "profound interpretation" or "rhapsodical texts;" though we, of course, are fortified in the soundness of our interpretation by finding that it was the uniform belief of the first three centuries, and that none of the ante-Nicene fathers can be shown to have entertained the slightest doubt or difference of opinion on it. Till the time of Arius, about the year 315, we can find no trace of any contrary opinion in any part of the Christian Church, and we know that the new opinion was scarcely publicly stated, when the whole Church of Alexandria, of which Arius was a presbyter, was at once in arms, and within five years at the utmost, in A.D. 320, Arius's doctrine was condemned, and Arius himself, with several of the clergy who followed him, were excommunicated and expelled from the city, by a council of nearly one hundred bishops of Ægypt and Lybia, held at Alexandria, as recorded by St. Epiphanius (Hær. 69, n. 3). But even if we could not so clearly trace the rise and date of the Anti-Trinitarian heresy, we should still be quite satisfied that the doctrine of the Trinity was a revealed truth, from the holy Scriptures alone, which we hold to be, when rightly interpreted, according to the rules of sound criticism, the rule of faith given us by God to guide us into all truth.

KEENAN'S CATECHISM IN KILPATRICK.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR,—I met Peter Doyle again last Sunday morning, and said I, "What's become of you ever since, Peter? the boys have been looking out for you and were disappointed you did not come." "Well," said he, "we left off in the middle of a chapter of Keenan, and I don't mind going to finish it for you." "I think," said I, "that as you read us your books the last couple of evenings, it would be only fair play now that you should hear a little of ours; but, however, we'll take you on your own terms, and Keenan let it be."

So when he came up and got out his book: "Do you remember," said he, "that I left off where he was saying how the Catholic doctrines are misrepresented by Protestants?"

Q. "Do not these ministers labour earnestly to impress the people with the notion that our doctrines are absurd?"

[A. "Yes; and by this have prevented many from inquiring. Yet how unfounded is this assertion. If our doctrines are absurd, why are they believed by five-sixths of Christianity?"]

"By how much?" said Malone.

"Five-sixths of Christianity," said Peter.

¹ It is a great mistake to suppose that the Records of the Councils, as we have them now, were drawn up and settled in the Councils themselves. Of some parts of those Records, such as the Canons, Creeds, &c., we have proof from the first. Some other parts of the present Records, we have no authority for except Anastasius, the librarian of the Pope's library at Rome, about the year 870; remarkable for the publication of many forged and interpolated documents.

² As to St. Cyprian, we have an article in type, for which we have no room in our present number; and we hope to take an early opportunity to examine Dr. Geraghty's remaining quotations also.

³ John xxi., 15-17. "Feed my sheep."

⁴ Barrow on the Supremacy, p. 103.

^a Opera Joannis Launoyi, tom. v., pt. 2. Lib. v., Epist. vii., ad Guiliel. Voellum, p. 106. Col. Allobrog., 1731.

"Well," said Malone, "Keenan is not the man, I see, to be afraid of a whooper when he thinks it will help the good cause. Why, you'll see in the *CATHOLIC LAYMAN*, see vol. ii, p. 40, that, according to their calculations, instead of being five-sixths, the Roman Catholics are less than the half."

"Oh," said Peter, "Keenan gives you his proofs. Turn to p. 88, and you'll find them. He takes his figures out of the *Scientific Miscellany*."

"Why, then," asked Malone, "what book is that; for I never heard of it before?"

"Then, with all your learning," said Peter, "don't you think there's lots of books in the world that you never heard of?"

"I'll tell you why I ask," said Malone. "When a book is quoted in the *CATHOLIC LAYMAN* they give you chapter and verse for it; they tell you where the book was printed, what edition they use, and in what volume and page the thing is to be found; so that any person of learning can see whether they are quoting fair or not. But I once was up at our clergyman's, Mr. Townsend's, and it is he that has more books than you'd see in a day's walk; and I asked him to show me some of the passages that Keenan quotes, and he told me that half of Keenan's quotations are out of books of no authority whatever, the very names of which are hardly ever heard of, and as to the other half he does not give a page or a chapter, so that you might as well look for a needle in a bundle of hay as try to find one of his quotations. 'And,' says Mr. Townsend, 'they say that when Sir Walter Scott was at a loss for a quotation he used to invent some lines and say he took them from an old play; and we might suspect Keenan of doing the same, only that I suppose the truth was, he copied these quotations in a lump out of other Roman Catholic books, and does not know himself any more than you do where the originals are to be found.' But," continued Malone, "I beg pardon for interrupting you. Go on and let us hear how the *Scientific Miscellany*, whatever that is, makes out that out of every six Christians five are Roman Catholics."

"Well," said Doyle, "here are Keenan's numbers. p. 88, 'The total number of Protestants in the world is 48,985,000; the total number of Greeks is 56,360,000; while the Catholics are 254,655,000; that is, the Catholics are six to one.'"

Well, if you didn't know before that Malone was the schoolmaster, you might have found it out then; and he seemed so glad at getting a sum to do. "What's that, what's that?" said he. "There are," he says, "over fifty millions of Greeks and nearly fifty millions of Protestants, that makes more than a hundred millions; so that if the Roman Catholics were five to one, or six to one, there ought to be five or six hundred millions of Roman Catholics, and he does not pretend that there are as many as half that number, for he only claims two hundred and fifty millions of Roman Catholics. After that, boys, I think you have had a lesson not to believe more than half what you find in Keenan."

Peter Doyle took a piece of paper, for he was not as quick at figures as Malone, and he cyphered them over and over, but he could not make them any different. "Well," says he, "at any rate, the figures show that the Catholics are more than double the other two together."

"Aye; but," said Malone, "if the figures only show them to be only two to one, what impudence it is of Keenan to talk of five to one and six to one. But when he makes such a hash of the figures he puts down in black and white, one cannot put much confidence in what he does not give the proofs for. I don't pretend to know much myself of the numbers of the different religions all over the world, but you see he counts all the Greek Christians in the world as fifty-six millions. Well in this article in the *CATHOLIC LAYMAN*, which makes out Roman Catholics to be less than half, the population of Russia is set down at 64 millions. Now, the bulk of the people in Russia belong to the Greek Church, and, if you knock off the odd four millions for Dissenters, you get more Greek Christians in Russia alone than Keenan has set down for them in the whole world."

"Well, let me look at his account of the Protestants. I see he counts, in America, thirty-four millions Roman Catholics and only nine millions Protestants. Why the population of the United States alone is over twenty millions and not a quarter of them Roman Catholics. I see he puts down in Oceania—that is to say, Australia and that part of the world—three millions and a half of Roman Catholics and only fifty thousand Protestants; that is to say, about 70 Roman Catholics to every one Protestant. I'd like to know where all these Roman Catholics are to be found; for I have always heard that in that part of the world there are more Protestants of the two. I say, Peter, you may take those figures of yours to light the fire with, for they are worth nothing."

Peter was not willing to give up his figures so easily, and was going on wrangling about a million here and a million there; till Malone cried—

"Tut, tut, man, do you suppose the question which religion is the right one is to be decided by counting heads. If that was the case, it would go hard with Christianity; for, after being preached now for nearly two thousand years, it is still sadly in the minority, with respect to the heathen. And if your Mr. Keenan was in the east and was driven to count heads with the Hindoos or the Bud-

dhist, he'd be very glad then to press into his service all the Protestants, much as he despises them now, and I have no doubt he'd find twice as many of them to take credit for as he is able to do cover now. And if any Hindoo were to answer him then in his own words, 'How can our doctrines be absurd when so many millions believe in them?' I think Father Keenan would say then that this was as good for nothing an argument as ever was brought forward. So that when I went to pull Keenan's figures to pieces, it was not that I cared if every one of them was right; but I could not help taking a shot at his dishonesty when I saw that he was not satisfied with putting down fancy figures for the numbers of both religions, but when he saw that his own figures only made out Roman Catholics to be two to one, boldly calling it five to one and six to one."

"Well," said Peter, "let me go on with the reading."

"If our doctrines are absurd, why are they believed by five-sixths of Christianity? why are the learned the best Catholics? and why is it that it is the most learned ministers of Oxford and Cambridge who are daily becoming Catholic?"

"The learned the best Catholics," said Malone; "that's just as true as the other story about the five-sixths. Why, if there was ever any doubt on which side the learning lay, there can be none now, after the conversions you are talking about."

"I don't see what you are driving at," says Peter.

"Suppose," said Malone, "you said your plough was the best, and Gasteen said his was the best, I might not know which of you was in the right; but if I saw that whenever he could get the use of yours, he never would employ his own at all, then there could be no mistake about it. Now, a few years ago, I might say the Protestant clergy had the most learning, and you might say your priests had the most learning, and no one could decide between us. But now it's easy to see. If a priest comes over to our side, no one makes much of him, or thinks he is better educated than our clergy, and they say that sometimes he is sent back to school to learn Greek. But when you get over a few of our clergy, they take the shine out of all your own; it's they that preach all your sermons, and write your books, and you have got some of them now to set up a Catholic University in Dublin, to give you a little of their learning."

"Well," said Doyle, "you can't deny we have got the learned men over now."

"Ah!" said Malone, "Flaherty here will tell you that in all his fishing he never made so good a haul but he left more fish in the sea behind him than those he took out of it, and you have got those that may be more learned than those they came to, but not more learned than those they leave behind them."

"There's more about the converts," said Doyle.

"We have converts in every class of society, from the nobleman to the mendicant. The former by becoming Catholic has much to endure; and the latter is refused even a cup of cold water, because he has become a member of the Catholic religion, and all this is endured for the sake of our absurd doctrines!"

"Well, boys," said Malone, "tell the honest truth, did you ever know that to happen—did you ever know of any one refused a cup of water for turning Roman Catholic?"

"I didn't, for one," said I; "but I know of Jimmy Brannan being half killed for turning Protestant, and I know of Biddy Sullivan's life being almost worried out of her by the other women in the workhouse because she would not turn Roman Catholic, and at last she had to come out, and only for Mr. Townsend, she would have starved; but I think if she had turned, instead of being refused a cup of cold water, she'd have got the best of everything, and Mr. Doyle here would have been the first to give it."

Well, they couldn't deny that I said the truth. So Peter went on.

Q. ["Are not attempts made, even now, all over these kingdoms to seduce the poor, and especially the young, by the offer of food and raiment?"]

A. Yes; the educated, the instructed, and comfortable Catholic is beyond seduction, and the snare is set by heresy for the hungry and the wretched."

"There you're hit now," said Doyle. "Didn't Mr. Townsend give clothes to the Brannans and the Cassidy's when they turned, and hasn't he found work for them in his own fields?"

"And what was he to do," said Malone. "Well I remember the work there was when they came over, when Father Pat cursed them from the altar, and forbade all his flock to speak a word to them, or to sell them a potato or a drop of milk, and none of you would give them a day's work. And then because Mr. Townsend didn't let them die on the roadside you talk as if he paid them to come over. Sure it's yourselves you have to blame for his giving them anything. He would have no need to do anything for them if you would only have let them alone."

"But what do you say to Mr. Townsend's schools?" said Doyle. "Doesn't he try there to get hold of the young and ignorant?"

"And what does Mr. Townsend do in his schools," said Malone, "that the priest doesn't do in his; only there's one thing that's true for you, and that is, that Father Pat never troubled his head much about educating

the people till he saw how Mr. Townsend's schools were thronged, and till he saw that if he didn't care to provide learning for the people, they would send their children to them that would."

"Aye; but," said Doyle, "you have not answered Keenan yet. I want to know why you Protestants, with your schools and your readers only try to pervert the poor and the ignorant and the children? Why don't you face those that have learning, and see what they would say to your arguments?"

"Well, and don't we," said Malone; "or who do you suppose the *CATHOLIC LAYMAN* is for? You can't say our side is afraid to face them that have learning, when they are ready to print the letters of any learned Roman Catholic that writes to them, and circulate, Mr. Townsend tells me, thirteen thousand copies of every number. And they have often invited the priests to write and show if they had made any mistakes or wrong arguments. It's not our fault if the priests run away and leave the laity to fight their battles for them."

Q. ["Do these seducers succeed even with the poor?"]

A. "No; for no sooner have the poor victims tried the religion of the seducers than they feel the remark of Dr. Johnson: The lacerations of conscience which they instantly experience make them hasten back to the altar of their fathers, to deplore their apostasy and implore forgiveness."—*Life of Johnson*, vol. ii, p. 99.]

"I don't know what Dr. Johnson says," said Malone; "but I know that many of those that came over to us have stuck to us to the last. There was Tom Cassidy, when he was dying, and all his relatives were about him begging him to send for the priest, he refused to see him, and said his whole confidence was in our Lord Jesus Christ. You remember what a fight there was when he was to be buried."

Q. ["Is there not something very striking in the conversions of the present day?"]

A. Yes; the most enlightened men of the Protestant Church, even multitudes of her ministers, are crowding, of their own accord, into the Catholic Church, while the ignorant and bigoted portion of the Protestant community are labouring hard, but without success to seduce, not the educated, but the poorest and most ignorant of the Catholic body."

"Well," said Malone, "if you have got any converts, it wasn't their learning that brought them to you, but 'twas in spite of their learning you got them. Sure there's Father Newman, the most learned of them all, has written a book to prove that the doctrines of the Church of Rome are not at all the same as those that were held by the early fathers; and that St. Cyprian and St. Chrysostom don't know half as much about our religion as Dr. Cullen. I say it's not learning that man wants, but common sense. His learning tells him quite right that the religion Dr. Cullen teaches is very different from what St. Chrysostom taught, but when he says that Dr. Cullen ought to know best, I say that's not common sense. But those that have come over to us, it's their learning that has brought them. If they had only learning enough to read the Bible, they found there the best of all learning, and were able to see that the doctrines now taught by the Church of Rome are not the same as those taught by the Apostles. And those that had learning enough to study further found that the fathers, too, didn't hold many of the new Romish doctrines. And the best proof that the priests know that learning and argument won't serve their cause is, that they do their best to stop all their people from hearing argument at all, or knowing what the Protestants have to say for themselves. You all know very well how they have tried to stop people from looking into the *CATHOLIC LAYMAN*, by telling lies of it. I know how surprised some of you were when you came to read it, and found that instead of its containing nothing but lies and ribald abuse of your religion, it only contained arguments in a Christian spirit, and facts so hard that none of the priests could answer them. So, as I said before, the *CATHOLIC LAYMAN* is a proof that Protestants are desirous to convince the understanding of the most educated; and if we are blamed for preaching to the poor also, we may be contented to bear the reproach in common with our Saviour, since while his enemies asked had any of the rulers or any of the Pharisees believed on him, he was not ashamed to take it as a mark of his religion, that the poor had the gospel preached to them."

We had more talk, sir, but this is all I have time to write at present.

Your obedient servant,

DENIS GASTEEN.

* Malone was quite right in not taking Mr. Keenan's word for this, or, indeed, for any other, quotation. We had the curiosity to turn to the passage in *Howe's Life of Johnson*, and were astonished at the audacity with which it was so distorted. From the manner in which the above sentence is worded, a y one would suppose that the sentence which comes between the word "remark," and the marks of quotation, contains the words of "Dr. Johnson's remark." In fact, however, these words are Mr. Keenan's own, and not Dr. Johnson's, with the exception of the single word "laceration," when Mr. Keenan uses unmeaningly, and Dr. Johnson with great propriety. The latter uses the phrase "laceration of mind" to describe the state of the Roman Catholic convert who brought to acknowledge the falsity of doctrines which, from his childhood, he had regarded as sacred truth, and which had so long formed, as it were, part of his mind. Such a "laceration" must inevitably be attended by returning of early and deep-rooted prejudices, and takes place when a Hindoo is converted to Christianity, just as much as when a Roman Catholic is converted to Protestantism. But in neither case need there be any laceration of conscience, for, on the contrary, a man's conscience orders him to profess the belief which his reason tells him to be true.—Ed. C. L.